



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,173	12/08/2003	Shawn W. O'Driscoll	ACM 340US	5061
23581	7590	05/04/2005	EXAMINER	
KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C. 520 S.W. YAMHILL STREET SUITE 200 PORTLAND, OR 97204			STOKES, CANDICE CAPRI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3732	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,173	Applicant(s) O'DRISCOLL ET AL.	
	Examiner Candice C. Stokes	Art Unit 3732	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/04/04:03/03/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Invention I (Claims 1-14) in the reply filed on 01/18/05 is acknowledged. Claims 15-30 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected bone plate and method of fixation, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Henniges et al (USPN 6,592,578). Henniges et al teach a system and method for installing plates for general bone repair. Henniges et al disclose "it is an additional feature of the present invention to color code the plates 10 for easy identification during a surgical procedure. The plates 10 can come in several different sizes and shapes depending on the specific application. By manufacturing the plates 10 with a unique color associated with each unique shape and size, confusion will be minimized and time will be saved. The color-coding will allow a doctor or nurse to identify and request the specific plate 10 and to better locate and implant screws and plates in vivo" (col. 6, lines 45-55). As to Claim 12, plates 10 include a curve bone-facing surface configured to match the curved contour of the distinct bone region to which each plate is

Art Unit: 3732

configured to be secured. Regarding Claim 13, the only difference between invention claimed in claim 1 and claim 13 is the printed matter, which in no way depends on the set, and the set does not depend on the printed matter. Therefore, the same rejection applied to claim 1 may also be applied to claim 13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1) Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henniges et al in view of Cain (USPN 5,720,502). Henniges et al teach the claimed invention except for the distinct color indicating a left or right half of the skeleton. In a similar art, Cain teaches a method for distinguishing the left half of the skeleton from the right half of the skeleton, in this case related to pain. This teaching shows that it known in the art to use color-coding methods to differentiate between the left and right half of the skeleton for various reasons. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Cain into the invention disclosed by Henniges et al to show that it is known in the art to use color-coding to differentiate different regions of the body for any purpose to better aides the surgeons and nurses during procedures.

2) Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henniges et al in view of Streli (USPN 4,565,193). Henniges et al discloses the claimed invention except for one of the distinct bone region including one of the humerus bone and the

Art Unit: 3732

proximal region and at least one of the bone plates includes at least one prong. Streli teaches a pronged plate “for use on the right or left half of the body”. Streli further teaches “using the pronged plate 1 in the region of the lower arm, the ulna and the radius” (col. 3, lines 40-41). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate the pronged plate used on the ulna into as taught by Streli into the set disclosed by Henniges et al in order to provide a means for better securing the plate the bone to better promote healing.

3) Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henniges et al in view of Weaver et al (USPN 6,623,486). Henniges et al disclose the claimed invention except for the bone plate have a first portion configured to be secured adjacent an end of a long bone and a second portion configured to be secured toward or one the shaft of the long bone and wherein the first portion is thinner than the second portion. Weaver et al shows in Fig. 8 that the first portion is generally thinner than the second portion of the plate. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the thinner first portion of the bone plate as taught by Weaver et al into the invention disclosed by Henniges et al in order to provide a bone plate which is better contoured to fit specific regions of bone and is better secured to the bone.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Candice C. Stokes whose telephone number is (571) 272-4714. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am - 4:30pm.

Art Unit: 3732

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Candice C. Stokes


Cary E. O'Connor
Primary Examiner